

SECRET

Subject: *VAIDANICH, Vasil Ivanovich - Soviet Exchange student in Rochester, NY

Source : Dr O.M. Bilaniuk, lecturer at the University of Rochester

Date : 10 Feb 1964

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3828
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. Subject is Ukrainian, aged 27, born in a village near UZHGOROD, Carpatho-Ukraine, son of poor peasants, engineer, now specializing in optics under students exchange program at University of Rochester, N.Y. where he lives in the Students Dormitory at 935 East Tower, Tel. GR 3 - 3000, East Tower Ext. 930. He finished desiatylitka in UZHGOROD and then studied at the Physico-Mathematical Faculty in Lvov Ivan Franko University. There graduated in 1961. After the graduation was employed "in various enterprises in Lvov and other cities of the Soviet Union".

Subject is married, his wife is Ukrainian, from Eastern Ukraine, physician. They have one daughter, born in Dec 1963. S's wife lives now with her parents in Eastern Podolia. S's parents, sisters and brothers live in Carpatho Ukraine.

University

2. Subject was met at the Library in Oct /Nov 1963 by a Ukrainian librarian by the name SHEPAROVYCH of Rochester, N.Y. The latter approached Subject when saw him reading "ravda", and asked whether he was Russian. The answer was yes. SHEPAROVYCH wanted to know where from : from the Soviet Union or from this country. Subject replied that from the former. Asked from what city named LVOV. Then SHEPAROVYCH ~~asked~~ asked whether he was Ukrainian to what Subject replied. "Of course, I am a Ukrainian".

Subject was quite willing to talk and to be introduced to other people. Thus he was also introduced to the Source and a Ukrainian engineer

SECRET

74-124-27/3
10 Feb 1964

~~SECRET~~

a friend of Source, by the name HAVRYLUK, fnu of Rochester, too.

Source himself met many times Subject, together with SHEPAROVYCH and HAVRYLUK arranged a New Year party for him and at one time Subject used to visit Source at his home at least twice a week. Subject went also to HAVRYLUK and SHEPA OVYCH and behaved very freely. He did not shun conversations and arguments but actually very often took initiative himself in discussing political topics. Subject always defended official party line and whenever he was pinned down and lacked further arguments he simply changed the topic. He never, however, was ready to admit openly his interlocutor's rightness.

Source helped Subject in sending a parcel for his wife to the Ukraine. Subject promised to get for Source a Physico-Mathematical Manual in Ukrainian by Prof GLAUBERMAN Aba Yukhymovich of Lvov University who at one time was S's lecturer. (N.B. Prof G. is listed in the Bibliograph of Lvov University phical Guide for 1962 as Professor, Chairman of the Dept of Solid Materials, in Lvov since 1948, graduated from Odessa University in 1939, born in 1917.)

3. Subject maintains contact with Ukrainian Mission in New York and last December went there for a few days. After his return told Source that he was quite impressed by New York City and " and walked along Broadway for 5 hours".

4. Subject is a thoroughly indoctrinated communist, of average intelligence, an apparatchik mainly int/erested in his career with no or very few capabilities and qualifications for scholarly work. He is an "administrative type" with talents ~~for~~ for organizational work but not for scientific job. He admitted himself that he had never been a bright student but rather on the contrary. Also in his present research he does not show usual scholarly interest and devotion.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Subject feels a profound gratitude to the Soviet regime for "making something out of him" and is aware that because of his weak points and not only out of gratitude he will have to serve the party to maintain his privileged status.

Subject seems to be well trained for answering us all attacks from Western people and in particular is quite well informed about some seamy sides of American reality. He is also well prepared to meet usual emigre-argumentation and very often simply "anticipates" his interlocutor's line of reasoning in order to countervail his arguments in advance. Thus, when Source, for instance, mentioned Russification Subject added that he should go ahead with enumerating quantity of Ukrainian books, lack of Ukrainian newspapers in the Russian SFSR, etc.

On the other hand he gets lost when encountering something he was not aware of. Thus, when asked how come such a "prudent and benevolent organization" as the communists party could let Stalin introduce his regime and where was the guarantee that the same party will not let another Stalin come to power in the future, Subject was unable to cope with the problem and at once changed the topic.

5. Some opinions expressed by Subject:

a/ Whatever the mishaps and "secondary" deficiencies of the socialist system, the latter will certainly prevail over capitalism. The main evil of capitalism is private ~~property~~ ownership. Where it exists there is exploitation. Source's and others' arguments about Soviet state-capitalism, monopoly of economic and political power etc - he discarded as "biased bourgeois nonsense". "It is ridiculous to speak about capitalism in the socialist Soviet system". It looked that he simply was unable to comprehend the problem and a priori regarded Source's arguments as complete nonsense.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

b/ Subject defended Stalin far beyond official line. He called him a great leader who had to do what he did. Sacrifices, hunger, concentration camps - all were necessary and negligible in comparison with "great construction of socialism", heavy industry also. Deficiencies and mishaps in agriculture and light industry will be in due time overcome. One cannot do all at once. Moreover after having had a war like the last one.

c/ American richness is illusory and accessible only to "capitalists". The majority of population lives in a status of permanent insecurity, threatened by economic crises, loss of job, illness. Subject is quite well informed about medical costs. On the other hand when strolling along with Source from store to store he remarked that "your problem is to have money and make choice of what to buy, ours is to find anything to buy". But then added that pretty soon "we shall have all we need, too".

His favorable topic is Negroes-problem, Alabama etc. He is quite
respective
familiar with events and developments.

d/ Soviet -Chinese conflict is real and serious but not to such a degree as capitalists would like to have it. "You will still regret in the future your joy about it". "Finally, we all are communists, we have same goals, it and doesn't matter who will be the first to introduce communism all over the world". "Moreover I am sure that sooner or later Chinese will realize their mistakes and return to proper policy".

e/ There is no russification in the Ukraine. On the contrary, Ukrainian culture and economy reached highest levels of development. The concept of amalgamation of nations refers to the future, i.e. to the highest stage of communism. Till then nations will exist and therefore it was ridiculous to talk about assimilation of Ukrainians. On this occasion he uses to point out that children's literature in Ukrainian is very large. In other words, the party would not do it if it were after assimilation of Ukrainians.

SECRET

SECRET

f/ The critique of young writers and artists was justified as far as they had committed mistakes. Emigrants want to see nationalists in them but ^{are} to no avail; they all ^{are} true communists.

g/ Soviets want to develop cultural exchange but Americans are against it, and want to keep it limited. As an example he uses to quote that 6 of his colleagues were rejected by American authorities and that Soviet students could not go beyond 25 miles circle around their location in the States.

h/ Anything published abroad he marks at once as biased, distorted, subjective. The series of articles by KUROPA in "Svoboda" given to him by HAVRYLUK he called "a ridiculous distortion" of reality in the Ukraine. He was, however, quite upset by "One Day of Ivan Denisovich" by Solzhenitsyn when presented with it by Source. (Source gave him photocopies from "Novy Mir")

6. Subject is the only Soviet student in Rochester. The other one did not arrive. Subject shares a room with an Indian, he also works together with an Asian. He seems to be quite interested in Asians and Africans and probably does not mind the opportunity to indoctrinate them. In Source's opinion it would be better to give Subject an American room-mate.

SECRET